

10007217-1

Amendment

7

REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration of the application.

Claims 1 – 21 were in the application. Claims 1, 3 – 13, 15 – 17, and 19 – 21 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,650,431). Claims 2, 14, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. in view of Lenhertz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,371,888).

The independent claims of the Application, namely, claims 1, 17, and 21, have been amended to include the limitations of administratively setting a threshold value to determine how many pages a print job must contain to be split and, when determining if the pages in the print job meet a criteria, basing the decision on both the threshold value and the information in the index. The Applicants believe that the amended claims are patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner (Roberts et al. and Lenhertz et al.), in that the references do not separately or in combination teach or suggest basing the decision to split a print job between printers based on a previously set page threshold, which may be preset by a printer administrator.

The amendments are supported by the specification (page 6, lines 1 thru 5), and no new matter has been added.

10007217-1

Amendment


8

The Applicant believes that application is now in condition for allowance, and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Hewlett-Packard Company
18110 SE 34th St.
Vancouver, WA 98683
360-212-0769

Edward G. Winston et al.

By: 
Larry D. Baker
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,593